

**JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION & POLICE COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**

Saturday, January 28, 2023 – 10:00 a.m.

Pomona College - Rose Hills Theatre

170 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Claremont, California

Meeting Conducted Via In-Person and Video Recording is Archived on the City Website  
<https://www.ci.claremont.ca.us/government/city-council/watch-city-council-meetings>

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT**

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS: ANDERSEN, ALVAREZ (arrived at 10:02), EDWARDS, EMERSON, GONZALEZ (Via Zoom), JONES, AND RAHMIM

POLICE COMMISSIONERS: DELEO, MARGIOTTA, MASON, PEREZ, TALBOT, AND TIRRIE

**ABSENT**

PLANNING COMMISSIONER: NONE

POLICE COMMISSIONER: MOHAMED

**ALSO PRESENT**

Katie Wand, Assistant to the City Manager; Alisha Patterson, City Attorney; Brad Johnson, Community Development Director; Aaron Fate, Police Chief; Chris Veirs, Principal Planner; Mike Ciszek, Police Captain; Jason Barber, Community Improvement Coordinator; Brad Fliehmman, Building Official; Adam Pirrie, City Manager; Jamie Earl, Assistant City Manager; Lindsey Coe, Administrative Assistant; and Nhi Atienza, Senior Administrative Assistant

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM**

**PROVIDE DIRECTION REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY'S EXISTING HOTEL/MOTEL ORDINANCE**

Group one decisions starts at 0:06:05 in the archived video.

Katie Wand, Assistant to the City Manager presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding the key decisions in Group One. Staff addressed Commissioners' inquiries regarding: a) staff's view on minimum hourly requirement; b) definition of nuisance; c) crime data in relation to hourly rates; d) location of sex activity; and e) definition of soliciting.

Chair Jones invited public comments to Group One.

Ginger Elliott is a resident. She suggested amending versions two or three of the ordinance as a means to attacking the criminal activity. Staff should write the ordinance in the strictest way possible. Meaning sticking to the overnight stays, registration, recording keeping, and implementation of a CUP for unusual circumstances that would need specific adjustments. She is very impressed with staff's work on this issue.

Wendy Ramallo is a resident of the I-10 corridor and is directly affected by what's going on at the motels. The sex act is one component of issue, we need to look at the other dangerous activity such as the sale and trafficking of drugs, weapons, and the harm cause to our officers and residents. She cited State Code 347 for nuisance. The ordinance and code enforcement are tools, but legal action against businesses is the biggest club. Legal action requires staffing. All these tools must be interrelated to be successful.

Bryan Trunik is very angry with the City. Staff has not done their jobs for years. An ordinance is needed. If a hotel needs an exception, they should apply for a CUP and go through the process. He noted that the previous general manager was paid by the pimps, two folks walking through his yard, and no long term stays are allowed in Claremont.

Andrew Behnke, General Manager of Double Tree Hotel spoke to the following items: a) confirmed that General Manager at Motel 6 was paid under the table and he has been offered the same deal; b) proposed nuisance ordinance with code updates based on business models of hotels; c) need exception for consecutive length of stay; d) don't limit cumulative length of stay since people have various reasons; e) don't impose minimum hour of stay as PD as stated that it's not an issue; and f) yes to allow hotel to vary pricing based on the length of stay.

Paul Wheeler stated that these motels do not deserve any special rights for their bad behavior. The City has the right to control their lot line and business license. He applaud the City for the effort, but this should have happened faster and leadership to need to do so.

Jim Keith spoke to raising our expectations of what we want the area to be. This process should be separated. Claremont has prohibited short term rentals and cheap room rates attract people who want a cheap "tryst". Hourly and day use rates will benefit Double Tree and make it worst for the problem hotels. If an exception is needed, the CUP process should be applied. Residents know that the 30-day stay is not being enforced and we know that the traffickers are the ones staying more than 30 days, not the professors.

Vicki Noble is encouraged by the process of creating a new ordinance and hopes that the process proceeds quickly as two homes in Westarms have gone up for sale this month. She was able to encourage another to remodel his home and stay. She is glad that for sale signs are not permitted in the front yards.

Darvin (via Zoom) is most impacted by what's going on at the motels, he is embarrassed of what he's seeing and does not feel safe. The problem is gotten worse over the years. Seems like the City is working against the residents, version two is written in favor of the motels. He is opposed to getting rid of the 60-day cumulative stay.

Jerry Klasik stated that the current Knights Inn is not a registered business in Claremont, the motel is registered as University Inn. The sign needs to be changed immediately so that people are not using the business under false pretense.

Sonja Stump stated that a strong ordinance will fix the issue, along with enforcement and leadership. Claremont has standards and needs to change the atmosphere, especially for the neighbors. The problem is moving north and we need to act fast. She thanked Mr. Behnke for doing a good job with the Double Tree.

There were no requests to speak.

Commissioner Mason responded to Chair Tirrie's inquiry regarding the discussion around not naming the scope around nuisance hotels. The statement of direction had three components: 1) ordinance, 2) law enforcement, and 3) nuisance action. The nuisance action should be agenized for a future meeting. The Commission can only recommend this action, only our City Council and City Attorney can act on this.

Commissioner Andersen agrees with Mr. Behnke on carving out exceptions, then the question is will it go through the CUP process or Community Development Director. He inquired how the updated ordinance will bring about a succession to what's going on.

City Attorney Patterson stated that we have tools such as the nuisance procedure, existing ordinance, and codes. The purpose of the updated ordinance is to layout expectations moving forward. Two tools that the Police Department would like to add are security cameras in the common areas and parking, and the ability to request for a credit card. For code enforcement, we would like to add a chapter that consolidates all the expectations in one location.

Chief Fate confirmed with Commissioner Andersen that the ability to request for a credit card will make a big difference.

Commissioner Perez is hoping to fast forward our recommendations to City Council. The ordinance is a long term solution. Nuisance abatement through the court process is the short term solution. There are a lot of other issues, but the criminal activity needs to be number 1. We need to use the civil code provide relief to our residents.

Commissioner Alvarez stated that the ordinance should blanket all hotels/motels, and exceptions are reviewed through the CUP process.

Commissioner Margiotta encouraged the City to pursue all three avenues, especially the nuisance abatement considering the 1.6 million deficit between the costs of service calls to the revenue from the hotels. This is not only a safety issue, it's an economic issue.

Commissioner Edwards understands that we need to act fast. The proposals presented target the activity. He is concern about certain exclusions, but also recognize the hotels that are operating professionally. This is a good start and we need to come back to the nuisance abatement.

Commissioner Mason agrees with Commissioners Margiotta and Perez.

Commissioner Rahmim stated that the problem surrounds the three motels is the south. The activity is unacceptable and the neighbors are miserable. He wonders if life in the south would be better off without the motels, considering the owners lack of care for Claremont and loss in revenue due to service calls. He inquired about the nuisance abatement process. The City needs to stop playing "footsies" and focus on the central issue.

City Attorney Patterson reviewed the nuisance abatement process with Commissioner Rahmim and clarified the zoning process with Commissioner DeLeo. The City cannot decide what will be built once rezoned. We need to focus on the ordinance and use the existing tools in the code, which will be consolidated.

Commissioner Gonzalez stated that the scope should encompass all the motels/hotels. Her concerns include: a) the effectiveness of the revised ordinance if we have not used our existing tools, b) data collection, and c) the enforcement coordination.

Commissioner Talbot wants to be mindful that what we agreed upon gets done and the mechanisms we put in place have teeth for enforcement.

Commissioner Emerson stated that the ordinance should be applied to all the motels/hotels, with the inclusion of a CUP process for exceptions. The City seems hesitant and should be using legal actions against these motels, we are not using the tools. He inquired about the use of the false name "Knights Inn" and if there are exceptions in special plan districts. He agrees with the broad definition of Guest.

Chair Tirrie stated that we should not take away any power from our existing ordinance, but instead make it stricter, with a focus on a general ordinance with the CUP curve out.

KEY DECISIONS – GROUP 1
<p><b>KEY DECISION #1:</b> Should the ordinance: (1) <i>proactively</i> apply to all hotels/motels (like Versions 1.0-3.0); or (2) only apply <i>reactively</i> to motels that have been declared a "nuisance" through nuisance abatement proceedings (like LB's ordinance)?</p> <p><b>Staff Rec:</b> Version 3.0 – <i>proactively</i> apply to all hotels/motels, including heightened requirements for freeway motels.</p> <p><b>Majority Vote:</b> Supports staff's recommendation.</p>
<p><b>KEY DECISION #2A:</b> Should the ordinance be a standalone chapter (as opposed to a section in the City's Chapter of regulations for Commercial Districts)?</p> <p><b>Staff Rec:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Majority Vote:</b> Supports staff's recommendation.</p>
<p><b>KEY DECISION #2B:</b> Should the ordinance stay in the Zoning Code (Title 16) or be moved to Title 5 of the Municipal Code ("Business Regulation")?</p> <p><b>Staff Rec:</b> Keep the ordinance in the Zoning Code (Title 16).</p> <p><b>Majority Vote:</b> Supports staff's recommendation.</p>
<p><b>KEY DECISION #4A:</b> What should be the limit for <i>consecutive</i> length of stay?</p> <p><b>Staff Rec:</b> 30 days.</p> <p><b>Majority Vote:</b> Supports staff's recommendation. May be considered for a CUP process.</p>
<p><b>KEY DECISION #4B:</b> What (if anything) should be the limit for <i>cumulative</i> length of stay?</p> <p><b>Staff Rec:</b> There should be no limit for cumulative length of stay, but hotels/motels must require guests to remove all of their belongings between stays to allow for regular cleaning and</p>

<p>maintenance.</p> <p><b>Majority Vote:</b> Does not support staff's recommendation. May be considered for a CUP process.</p>
<p><b>KEY DECISION #5:</b> Should the ordinance impose a minimum hour requirement on what constitutes an "overnight stay"? (e.g., 12 hours? 18 hours?)</p> <p><b>Staff Rec:</b> No. The ordinance should simply require rooms be rented for an "overnight" stay (with a narrow, case-by-case exception for "day use" room rentals).</p> <p><b>Majority Vote:</b> Does not support staff's recommendation. May be considered for a CUP process.</p>
<p><b>KEY DECISION #6:</b> Should the ordinance allow hotels/motels to re-rent rooms if a guest checks out early?</p> <p><b>Staff Rec:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Majority Vote:</b> Does not support staff's recommendation. May be considered for a CUP process.</p>
<p><b>KEY DECISION #7A:</b> Should the ordinance allow hotels/motels to rent rooms for "day use" on a case-by-case basis? ("Day use" means renting a room for less than a full night's stay.)</p> <p><b>Staff Rec:</b> Yes, as long as the ordinance requires the City's Community Development Director to carefully vet the hotel/motel's track record of compliance with the law and closely monitor the hotel/motel use of "day use" rates to ensure it does not create any criminal or nuisance activity.</p> <p><b>Majority Vote:</b> Does not support staff's recommendation. May be considered for a CUP process.</p>
<p><b>KEY DECISION #7B:</b> Should the ordinance allow hotels/motels to offer varied pricing based on length of stay (e.g., lower rates for longer stays)?</p> <p><b>Staff Rec:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Majority Vote:</b> Supports staff's recommendation.</p>

The Commissions recessed at 12:22 p.m.

The Commissions reconvened at 12:32 p.m.

Group two decisions starts at 2:32:17 in the archived video.

Katie Wand, Assistant to the City Manager presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding the key decisions in Group Two. Staff addressed Commissioners' inquiries regarding: a) senior management signing off on guest register; b) justification of legal action against freeway motels; c) ID scanning; d) creation of false documents from scanning; e) scanner cost; f) PD's process to access records; g) record retention; h) enforcement of data security; i) credit card requirement; j) definition of occupant/guest; and k) definition of freeway motels.

Chair Jones invited public comments to Group Two.

Andrew Behnke spoke to the following: a) cost of responding to calls in the area is 1.2 million; b) cost of a full time officer to patrol the area is \$218,000; c) item #3, a guest is difficult to enforce,

we're better off looking at the occupant; e) item #9A is not needed, all hotels are required to keep a register; f) scanning can be done, the cost of a scanner is \$188 and a stand-alone micro PC is \$300; g) digital check-ins should be a CUP process; and h) record retention should be five years.

Ali Jaffe, new General Manager of Motel 6 stated that in the past three months they have implemented the use of credit/debit card, ID scanning w/ the Hotel Key software (pictures are not captured as it is a violation), parking permits, and are registering guests as any adult to the room. There has been a 50% reduction in service calls. Service calls may include calls for welfare or traffic checks. His background is from Anaheim and he was brought in to fix the problem. He looks forward to working with the staff and neighbors. He wished he spoke to the items in Group One, as it is a violation to remove a guest after 60 days due to tenant rights.

Wendy Ramallo stated that the enhancements proposed are evidence based, legal, and reasonable. This is not a problem with good operators. She supports all the recommendation except the record retention for one year, it needs to be longer.

Bryan Trunik stated that the residents have been going through this for years and he is not sympathetic with the length of the meeting. City staff have been making silly recommendations. These motels should be required to go through the CUP process so that the public is involved. Staff have not been doing their jobs and the neighbors do not trust the City. Motel 6 are not good neighbors.

Sam, owner of Motel 6 apologized for the previous years. The old general manager have been removed. In the past three months, there has been drastic change in the numbers of service calls for motel/traffic issues (23 in November, 14 in December, and 6 in January). They utilize a proprietary software that blocks the image due to legal action, but information is shared willingly with the police department.

Jim Keith spoke on the following items: a) we should consider the City of Long Beach and Pomona's requirement for the 12 hour minimum stay and not eliminate our current 18 hour minimum requirement; b) we should have a staff request to see the register to ensure that what we're proposing is recorded, this will also show if a guest has stayed more than 30 days; and c) guest required to be in the guest register is impossible, parking control with a key will change the current brothel activity. He is happy that the frequency is less now.

Charles Hepperle (via Zoom), resident agrees with Jim's statements.

Darvin (via Zoom) spoke on the following items: a) the Community Development Director should not be granted the right to provide special privileges, such as day use and digital check ins; b) correction to Commissioners Rahmim's comment, he never had a prostitute in his front yard, it was on American and Indian Hill; c) what the motels are costing the City is a good angle to look at, but he agrees with City Attorney Patterson that if we get rid of the motel, we are not guaranteed what the replacement will be. He would just be happy if the motel was properly operated; and d) 57% of the sales tax is from south Claremont, 15% from the village, and 17% from the Foothill corridor, and look at the way we are treated. There is an inequity and we need to change this; and e) we need to follow through the ordinance.

There were no requests to speak.

Commissioner Andersen stated that section 9c should be done with a CUP and the record retention should be more than one year.

Commissioner Margiotta concurs with Commissioner Andersen. She inquired if no image scanning is an industry standard. She is not sure how enforceable or realistic the definition of Guest is.

Commissioner Gonzalez concurs with the previous comments.

Commissioner Mason stated that the ordinance presented to the Planning Commission had been modified from its original form and he request that it not be done again. The original document prepared by the Police Commission Subcommittee proposed a three year retention period, 18 hour stay minimum, and inspection requests. This is a watering down of the document and rejects the modifications by staff. He is not sympathetic to Motel 6.

Commissioner Alvarez stated that the definition of guest and the guest register should be extended to all motels/hotels and the retention period should be seven years. Chief Fate confirmed that Motel 6 does share information with the police department, but not with staff.

Commissioner DeLeo concurs with Commissioner Mason. He is also in accordance with Jim Keith's comments regarding courted off parking with key cards for all freeway hotels.

Commissioner Edwards stated that the ordinance should apply to all motels/hotels and the ones that need exclusions can apply for an exception. The reach of the activity is shown to go beyond the freeway motels.

Commissioner Talbot amplified Commissioner Mason's comments. It bothers him that months of volunteer time devoted to the issue has been underwritten.

Commissioner Rahmim stated that enforcement has been left to the motels to manage and this is not working. Seems like a lot of the restrictions have been lifted, noting the one-year retention is the wrong direction.

Commissioner Emerson spoke on the following items: a) definition of Guest shall be the person paying and the primary user shall be the occupant; b) freeway motel/hotel should be defined in the definition section; c) every motel/hotel should keep a guest register; d) scanning should not be required, staff can simple write the information; e) he is not too clear on digital check-in, Andrew Behnke provided more information on the Hilton Honors Program and the digital check-in process; f) record retention should remain at the current four years, going to five to seven years is fine too; and g) staff needs to specify how long a guest register should be retained.

Chair Tirrie spoke on the following items: a) the ordinance should be written as a stringent blanket ordinance with the CUP process to support properly operating businesses; b) she concurs with the definition of Guest as defined in Version 1; c) record retention is the cost of doing business, she supports the suggested seven years retention; and d) for a future date, she would like to know if the number of welfare checks are specific to this hotel and what the calls relate to.

Chief Fate stated that welfare checks varies for any reason and they are usually in areas that have activity.

**KEY DECISIONS – GROUP 2**

**KEY DECISION #8A:** Should the ordinance require guests to provide a valid credit/debit card as a way to verify their identity?

**Staff Rec:** Yes.

**Majority Vote:** Supports staff's recommendation.

**KEY DECISION #8B:** Should the ordinance allow guests to pay for rooms with cash?

**Staff Rec:** Yes, if guests are required to present a valid credit/debit card.

**Majority Vote:** Supports staff's recommendation. May be considered in a CUP process.

**KEY DECISION #9A:** Which hotels/motels should be required to keep a guest register? (All hotels/motels? Freeway motels only? Hotels/motels that have been declared to be nuisances only?)

**Staff Rec:** Freeway motels only (more likely to attract criminal and nuisance activity as a result of their location and configuration).

**Majority Vote:** Supports staff's recommendation for all motels/hotels.

**KEY DECISION #9B:** Should hotels/motels be required to scan images of a guest's Identification Documents?

**Staff Rec:** No, but the freeway motels should be required to gather key pieces of information from the Identification Documents that law enforcement would need for an investigation (name, date of birth, license number), and an employee should be required to attest that picture on the guest's Identification Documents matched the guest.

**Majority Vote:** Supports scanning for all motels/hotels.

**KEY DECISION #9C:** Should the ordinance allow the City's Community Development Director to allow a hotel/motel to offer digital check ins?

**Staff Rec:** Yes, on a case-by-case basis if hotel/motel is in full compliance with ordinance and has no history of criminal activities.

**Majority Vote:** Does not support staff's recommendation. May be considered for a CUP process.

**KEY DECISION #9D:** What is the appropriate retention period for hotel/motel records, including the guest register?

**Staff Rec:** 1 year.

**Majority Vote:** Does not support staff's recommendation. It should be no less than four years.

**KEY DECISION #3:** How broadly should the ordinance define the term "guest"? This definition is important because, the draft ordinances propose that, for freeway motels only, all "guests" must be included in the motel's guest register, and the motel must verify their identity.

**Staff Rec:** Define "guest" broadly to encompass almost every person who enters a hotel/motel room, even if they are not staying overnight. Include visitors of occupants in the definition of "guest." Exclude hotel/motel employees and minors in the care or custody of a guest.

**Recommended change to Version 3.0 –** Define "guest" to include the person paying for the room, even if they do not enter the room (e.g., "straw buyers").



**Majority Vote:** Ordinance should apply to all motel/hotel. Freeway motel does not need to be defined. Definition of Guest should be “any occupant authorized to have a room key and to enter the room by the payer” as suggested by Andrew Behnke.

The Commissions recessed at 2:16 p.m.

Commissioner Andersen left the meeting at 2:16 p.m.

The Commissions reconvened at 2:22 p.m.

Group three decisions starts at 4:23:16 in the archived video.

Katie Wand, Assistant to the City Manager presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding the key decisions in Group Two. Staff addressed Commissioners’ inquiries regarding: a) warrantless inspections; b) parking and fencing; c) approved budget for a police officer and code enforcement officer; and d) warrantless inspection consistent with the Patel case.

Chair Jones invited public comments to Group Three.

Andrew Behnke, General Manager of the Double Tree Hotel spoke on the following items: a) secured parking is impossible, as his hotel has shared parking; b) he’s not too sure on permit parking, as his hotel has shared parking; c) cctv cameras would cost over \$100,000 and requested that the City offset the cost, if implemented; d) no comments regarding the prohibition of kitchen amenities; e) no problems with security and cleanliness; f) requirement of a long-term stay hotel be in amenity rich location should not be included; g) the Double Tree Hotel is all interior corridor.

Wendy Ramallo spoke on the following items: a) thanked City staff for all the hard work, there has been information sharing, and she’s coming away a more informed resident; b) enhanced enforcement, provisions, and public transparency is the best recommendation we can give City Council, including requesting for specific staffing resources; c) the long-term stay in relation to amenities should be removed, the built environment decisions have increased crime and inequity in the south.

Sue Keith stated that the treatment of the residents to the south is not a testament to equality. If we were equal, the I-10 would be attractive and safe. Equity should be the focus.

Bryan Trunik spoke on the following items: a) a CUP process should be put in place for exceptions; b) he does not trust the City, therefore a community member must be included in the CIT; and c) the Architectural Commission did a great job.

Jim Keith spoke on the following items: a) he rescinded his request for fenced parking; b) video surveillance is a must, it does not need to be \$100,000; c) request to motel staff to review records; d) quarterly reports from the City Energy Departmental Mental Team is excellent; and e) his new request for an assigned Sargent the area.

Sam, owner of Motel 6 spoke on the following items: a) concerns over guest privacy once guest register is turned over for review; b) secured parking is a concern since Motel 6’s parking is also used for deliveries; and c) possible sale of Motel 6 to the City.

There were no requests to speak.

Commissioner Alvarez spoke to the following items: a) cctv cameras should be for all motels/hotels; b) he is concerned about the kitchen facilities, due to the fire hazard; c) we need to make sure we meet the Patel case regarding warrantless inspections; and d) he likes the CIT.

Commissioner Margiotta wondered if cameras would be just effective on their own. She received confirmation that footage would be included in the warrantless inspection. Items # 12 and 14 are not in her purview. She likes the interdepartmental team proposal.

Commissioner Gonzalez had no comments.

Commissioner Mason inquired how item #12 came about, it's not what the committee presented. City Attorney Patterson stated that it was a clean-up item.

Commissioner Perez had no comments

Commissioner Edwards is not sure why item #14 is part of the discussion, as it is contrary to the mindset of visitors enjoying and venturing around. The CIT is a great idea and including a community member is essential.

Commissioner DeLeo rescinded his comment regarding gated parking and key car parking.

Commissioner Rahmim spoke on the following items: a) Motel 6's parking is not intermingled with the other businesses; b) the need to treat Motel 6 differently, as they historically have not been good neighbors; c) we should stick to the tighter restrictions; e) the CIT is a great idea.

Commissioner Talbot requested that the Police Commission receive quarterly report from the CIT.

Commissioner Emerson spoke to the following items: a) permit parking for all and secured parking, only if it's practical; b) cctv cameras for all in common areas and entry ways; c) no comments on item #13; d) open spaces should be eliminated on item #14; e) item #15 is ok; f) item #16 is good; g) item #17 should include a key reference on enforcement; h) item #18 is a great idea and needs to include the process to deeming a nuisance.

Commissioner spoke on the following items: a) keep the existing with the use of a CUP for item #12; b) she concurs with Commissioner Margiotta regarding the cctv footage; c) keep the existing with the use of a CUP for item #14; d) she agrees that a community member from the impacted area and an additional staff member should be included on the CIT.

Chair Jones confirmed that long term stay hotels would require a CUP and encouraged the Commission to think about changing long term provisions to include kitchens in new hotels.

### KEY DECISIONS – GROUP 3

**KEY DECISION #10:** Should the ordinance require secured parking or permit parking for hotels/motels?

**Staff Rec:** Require permit parking for freeway motels only (more likely to attract criminal and nuisance activity as a result of their location and configuration). Do not require secured parking

for any hotels or motels.  
**Majority Vote:** Supports staff's recommendation for all motels/hotels. May be considered for a CUP process.

**KEY DECISION #11:** Should the ordinance require hotels/motels to have CCTV cameras in their common areas and parking areas?

**Staff Rec:** Yes, for freeway motels only (more likely to attract criminal and nuisance activity as a result of their location and configuration).

**Majority Vote:** Supports staff's recommendation for all motels/hotels. May be considered for a CUP process for cctv camera in parking areas only.

**KEY DECISION #12:** Should hotel/motel guest rooms be prohibited from having a kitchen or cooking facilities, other than a microwave and small refrigerator, except in long-term stay hotels?

**Staff Rec:** Eliminate prohibition on guest rooms in hotels/motels having kitchens or cooking facilities.

**Majority Vote:** Tabled item for Planning Commission's review.

**KEY DECISION #13:** Should the ordinance explicitly outline site and operational requirements, like security, cleanliness, room furnishings, and the condition of the exterior of the property and common areas?

**Staff Rec:** Yes.

**Majority Vote:** Supports staff's recommendation.

**KEY DECISION #14:** Should the ordinance require long-term stay hotels to be located in an area with a "concentration of amenities" for guests, including restaurant retail, recreation, open space, and exercise facilities.

**Staff Rec:** Yes.

**Majority Vote:** Tabled item for Planning Commission's review.

**KEY DECISION #15:** Staff recommends Version 2.0 or 3.0 to remove warrantless inspection requirement.

**Majority Vote:** Warrantless inspections shall be consistent with the Patel case.

**KEY DECISION #16:** What is the appropriate amortization period for hotels/motels to bring their (1) operations, and (2) sites into compliance with the new ordinance?

**Staff Rec:** 3 months for changes to operations; 1 year for physical improvements to site; option for Community Development Director to extend deadlines for hotels/motels making diligent progress toward compliance.

**Majority Vote:** Supports staff's recommendation with a one-time one-year extension for physical improvements.

**KEY DECISION #17:** None

**Notation:** Include reference key for enforcement.

**KEY DECISION #18:** What (if any) types of City and community oversight and reporting requirements should the ordinance require?

**Staff Rec:** In response to feedback from the October 4, 2022 Planning Commission meeting and the November 29, 2022 listening session, staff recommends the ordinance include the following additional oversight and reporting features:

1. Like Long Beach, establish a City Interdepartmental Team (CIT) to proactively address criminal and nuisance activities at hotels and motels, particularly at freeway motels.
2. The CIT must prepare quarterly reports on their activities and post them on the City's website.
3. The CIT must provide an annual report to the City Council.

The City must create a comment form, posted on the City's website to allow members of the public to provide feedback on hotels and motels.

**Majority Vote:** Supports staff's recommendation with the inclusion of a member from the community.

City Attorney Patterson confirmed that CUP runs with the land.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Jones adjourned the meeting at 3:44 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Chair

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Administrative Assistant